



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,276	11/27/2001	David B. Donahue	10547-0020-999	2346
20991	7590	08/24/2006	EXAMINER	
THE DIRECTV GROUP INC			HAMZA, FARUK	
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109				
P O BOX 956			ART UNIT	
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			PAPER NUMBER	
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on July 18, 2006. Claims 1-2,7-8,11-13,17-20,22 and 26 have been amended. Claims 23-24 have been canceled. Claims 1-22 and 25-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claim 1-8,11-22 and 25-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beser (U.S. Patent Number 6,049,826) hereinafter referred as Beser.

Beser teaches the invention as claimed including creating a new configuration file with a dynamic protocol server allows greater flexibility for configuring cable modems in a data-over-cable system (See abstract).

As to claim 1, Beser teaches a method for automatic configuration of a bi-directional Internet Protocol (IP) communication device to establish an Internet connection, comprising:

automatically broadcasting a request from a bi-directional Internet protocol (IP) communication device selected from either a DSL gateway or cable modem for basic configuration details for the IP communication device over an IP network to the Internet and a remote server connected thereto, where said request contains a unique bi-directional IP communication device identifier stored in the IP communication device and associated with a unique user (Fig. 5, Fig. 7A-7B, Column 13, lines 25-Column 17, lines 50, Beser discloses requesting for configuration);

receiving said basic configuration details including an IP address from the server at said device, where said basic configuration details are assigned to said unique user based on said unique bi-directional IP communication device

identifier (Fig. 5, Fig. 7A-7B, Column 13, lines 25-Column 17, lines 50, Beser discloses receiving configuration); and

said bi-directional IP communicating device automatically configuring itself with said basic configuration details to establish an Internet connection (Fig. 5, Fig. 7A-7B, Column 13, lines 25-Column 17, lines 50, Beser discloses cable modem configuring itself).

Claims 17, 19, 22 and 26 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 1 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 2, Beser teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said remote server is a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) server (Column 13, lines 25-36).

As to claim 3, Beser teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said receiving comprises obtaining said IP address from said DHCP server (Column 16, lines 1-45).

As to claim 4, Beser teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising transmitting a configuration request for additional configuration details (Fig. 7A).

As to claim 5, Beser teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising receiving said additional configuration details specific to said unique user (Column 4, lines 8-25, Column 8, lines 40-55).

As to claim 6, Beser teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising configuring said bi-directional IP communication device with said additional configuration details (Fig. 7).

As to claim 7, Beser teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising, before said broadcasting step, the steps of:

connecting said bi-directional IP communication device to a communication line (Column 9, lines 41-67); and

powering said bi-directional IP communication device on (Column 9, lines 41-67).

As to claim 8, Beser teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising, before said broadcasting step, the step of automatically detecting a communication circuit over said communication line (Column 9, lines 41-67).

As to claim 11, Beser teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the address of the DHCP server is unknown to the IP communication device said broadcasting

Art Unit: 2155

comprises broadcasting a DHCP Discover request using a TCP/IP broadcast (Column 13, lines 25-67).

Claims 18 and 20 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 12, Beser teaches the method of claim 11, wherein said DHCP server validates the request, said receiving comprises acquiring a DHCP offer message from the DHCP server broadcast as a TCIP/IP broadcast and accepting the IP address (Column 13, lines 25-Column 16, lines 45).

As to claim 13, Beser teaches the method of claim 12, further comprising, prior to said configuring step, the steps of:

 sending a DHCP Request message to at least the DHCP server (Column 13, lines 25-Column 16, lines 45); and

 receiving a DHCP acknowledge message from the DHCP server (Column 13, lines 25-Column 16, lines 45).

As to claim 14, Beser teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said broadcasting and receiving steps occur automatically without any communication between said bi-directional IP communication device and a client computer

coupled to said bi-directional IP communication device.

As to claim 15, Beser teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising, prior to said configuring step, the steps of:

assigning said unique bi-directional IP communication device identifier to said bi-directional IP communication device (Column 13, lines 25-Column 16, lines 45); and

associating said unique bi-directional IP communication device identifier with said unique user (Column 13, lines 25-Column 16, lines 45).

As to claim 16, Beser teaches the method of claim 15, further comprising generating a configuration table listing bi-directional IP communication device identifiers, associated users and each user's basic configuration details (Column 3, lines 59-Column 4, lines 7).

Claim 21 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 16 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claims 25 and 27, Beser teaches a method comprising before said broadcasting step, the step of automatically detecting a dial-tone for the internet protocol (Column 9, lines 40-67, table 1).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beser as applied above, and further in view of Huotari et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0004935) hereinafter referred as Huotari.

Beser teaches the invention substantially as claimed including creating a new configuration file with a dynamic protocol server allows greater flexibility for configuring cable modems in a data-over-cable system (See abstract).

As to claim 9, Beser teaches the method of claim 1.

Beser does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of determining Permanent Virtual Circuit (PVC).

However, Huotari teaches the claimed limitation of determining Permanent Virtual Circuit (PVC) (P[0038]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beser by adding functionality for determining Permanent Virtual Circuit (PVC), which provides secure communication to the users. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's communication.

As to claim 10, Beser teaches the method of claim 9.

Beser does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of determining VPI/CI (Virtual Path Identifier/Virtual Channel Identifier) pair for communications.

However, Huotari teaches the claimed limitation of determining VPI/CI (Virtual Path Identifier/Virtual Channel Identifier) pair for communications (P[0080]-[0081]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beser by adding functionality for VPI/CI (Virtual Path Identifier/Virtual Channel Identifier) pair for communications, which provides secure communication to the users. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's communication.

4. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2155

571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).

Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unite 2155


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER